

A Discourse Analysis of Japanese Invitations

Author(s): Polly Szatrowski

Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1987), pp. 270-284

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

A Discourse Analysis of Japanese Invitations
 Polly Szatrowski
 The University of Michigan

The standard invitation/request form in Japanese, given in (1) below, is viewed by many linguists and given in most Japanese textbooks as the primary invitation/request form for any social context.¹

- (1) $\frac{V\text{root} + -(a)nai\ ka\sqrt{2}}{V\text{root}\quad NEG, IPF\quad Q}$
 Won't you do V?

However, the standard form was used in only a few of the invitations found in the 25 hours of actual telephone conversations collected in Japan for this study. What goes on among friends and acquaintances in this context is a careful process of negotiation regulated by 1) lexical contextualization cues given by the person making the invitation, 2) the prior text or shared experience of the individuals involved, and 3) responses from the invitee; these included silence, minimal listener response, acknowledgement, positive/negative assessment of the information, and requests for further information.

My approach is within the framework of conversational analysis, broadly speaking.³ In this paper I concentrate on four invitations to a tea ceremony by a woman I will call Nakano-san. On separate occasions she called and invited two close friends, her aunt and another friend whom she had known for less time. Transcriptions of these invitations are given in Conversations I through IV, respectively, in the Appendix.⁴ Given the absence of the standard form in many of the invitations I studied, I address the questions: How does the invitee know that they are being invited? Why should the person making an invitation use more abstract forms instead of the form that everyone claims is the standard?

In both Conversations I and II, between close friends, Nakano-san used the extended predicate construction instead of the standard form, that is, predicate + no (a nominalizer) in line 1 of Conversation I and predicate + \bar{n} da in line 3 of Conversation II. Jordan and Noda (in press) claim that Japanese use this construction to relate the predicate before no or \bar{n} da to something in the real world which is known by the speaker and known or assumed to be known by the addressee. This pattern is often used as an explanation. I will translate the no and \bar{n} da forms, which nominalize the preceding predicate, as "it's that". Thus, in Conversation I Nakano-san began by saying

- (2) N-koñdo ne⁵ otyakai ġa aru no yo. --uti no syusai no
 this time you know?, it's that there's a tea ceremony!
--siti-ġatu no mik-ka, nitiyoobi.
 --one sponsored by my group, July 3, Sunday.

Her friend Shiba-san immediately refused the invitation. In Conversation II, Nakano-san began with an utterance which anticipated a negative response from Ichikawa-san followed by a similar extended predicate expression.

- (3) N-tabun doo ka na to omou n̄ da kedo,
 it's that I think you probably won't be interested but,
mata otyakai g̃a aru n̄ da kedo,
 it's that there's a tea ceremony again but,

Ichikawa-san asked when it would be and refused indirectly by explaining that she had a tennis match on the third and fifth.

In both of these conversations Nakano-san referred back to previous invitations. In Conversation I, Nakano-san and Shiba-san shared many prior texts of doing things together. The use of koñdo, "this time", in (2), suggested that this was the next invitation in the series of invitations they had shared up to the present. In Conversation II, Nakano-san used mata, "again" in (3) to refer back to previous tea ceremony invitations which Ichikawa-san had refused after prefacing her event presentation with a statement which anticipated another refusal. Thus, Nakano-san's lexical contextualization cues along with the prior invitation texts which these friends shared influenced Nakano-san's friends in their interpretations of her discourse.

In Conversation III, Nakano-san invited her aunt, again beginning with a statement of the event and date using the extended predicate construction as given in (4) below. However, her utterance did not contain any lexical contextualization cues as in the previous two conversations.

- (4) N-Siti-g̃atu no mik-ka ni ne¹ otyakai g̃a aru n̄ da kedo,
 On July 3, you know?, it's that there is a tea ceremony but,

The aunt responded with a question, "July 3?", after which Nakano-san continued with the standard invitation/request form.

- (5) N-Ikanai?
 Won't (you) go?

The aunt said "What? A tea ceremony? Where?" and after being told where the ceremony would take place commented that it was really far away. At this point Nakano-san sensed some reluctance on her aunt's part and suggested an out.

- (6) N-Zikañ nai ka.
 (You) don't have the time?

The aunt responded that she hadn't cleaned things up yet. This ended the invitation. Nakano-san mentioned to me later that the aunt had refused.

Conversation IV was with Kato-san, a friend Nakano-san had not known as long as Shiba-san and Ichikawa-san. After greetings and getting Kato-san's attention Nakano-san began as follows.

(7)N-Zitu wa anoo otyakai gā koñdo no siti-gātu:: no
the fact is um it's that there's a tea ceremony
mik-ka ka na, nitiyoobi, aru no ne⁵
on this coming Sunday, July 3, you know?

The subsequent conversation consisted of an event presentation which was much longer than that of Conversations I through III; Nakano-san gave the date, day, sponsor, place and cost, in that order using the extended predicate construction but no contextualization cues until much later in the conversation.

In Conversations I through IV, the presentation of events could have been interpreted in a variety of ways. Nakano-san was in the habit of visiting her aunt on the way to the beauty parlor near her aunt's house, where she often went to get help putting on her kimono. Since tea ceremonies are events in Japan which often require kimono, the opening event presentation in Conversation III could have been leading to a conversation about dropping by on July 3 on the way to the beauty parlor. Nakano-san rarely invited her aunt out to do things, although she frequently went to visit her. Conversations I and II also left other options open. For example, the presentation of events in (2) and (3) could have lead to a conversation about borrowing something for that day. However, the invitation interpretation was highly salient because of prior shared invitations in Nakano-san and her friends' relationships and the contextualizations cues. Conversation IV will be discussed in more detail below.

It is interesting that in Conversations I, II and IV Nakano-san never made an explicit invitation; to borrow Brown and Levinson's (1978) terminology, the invitation was "off record". Since Nakano-san used the extended predicate in her presentation of the events instead of the standard form, she could not be held to have committed herself to the intent of an invitation, yet in each of these cases Nakano-san told me that she had intended to invite these four people. In Conversations I and II, although the invitation was off record, it was immediately recognized as an invitation. In Conversation IV, the issue of whether or not it was an invitation was negotiated and was finally resolved to be an invitation. It is also common in Japanese to abort an invitation at the event presentation stage. In these cases, the potential invitee may not even notice that an invitation had been in the making. The invitation-- and even what an invitation is-- is subject to negotiation in the conversation.

Brown and Levinson's (1978) and Brown's (1980) work on politeness helps to illuminate why the standard form would not be used in every social context. They propose a model of politeness based on the view that people have positive and negative face wants. Positive face wants refer to the "desires to be liked,

admired, ratified and related to positively", while negative face wants refer to the desires to have one's privacy respected and to not be imposed on (Brown 1980: 114-5). They give three factors which determine the level of politeness used in a given situation: 1- the status of the individuals involved, 2- the amount of social distance between the individuals involved, and 3- the nature of the speech act, in particular, the degree of risk of threatening the other's face by performing an act.

In invitations there is a risk to the invitee's negative face, because the invitation might put the invitee in a position where they have to refuse. This would in turn threaten the person making the invitation's positive face because it would threaten their desire to be liked, a desire which is partially fulfilled by doing things together. A pilot comparison of Japanese and English conversations suggested that the risk involved in putting the invitee into a position where they might have to refuse, i.e. the threat to the invitee's negative face, was the primary concern in the Japanese case. On the other hand, the risk of threatening the invitee's positive face by not involving the invitee, seemed to be of more concern in the American case. In other words, the Japanese used strategies which avoided putting the invitee into a position where they would refuse, while Americans used strategies which put the invitee into a position where they would accept. The Japanese tended to play down the positive aspects of the invitation and in fact avoided making the invitation explicit until there was a clear indication that the invitee was interested in the event. In cases where the invitation was recognized and the invitee seemed reluctant, the person making the invitation would offer excuses or ways out for the invitee so that they would not have to refuse. This was the case in Conversation III, line 5 where Nakano-san offered her aunt a way out by suggesting that her aunt did not have the time. On the other hand, Americans tended to play up the positive aspects of the event, in a sense selling the invitation and trying to win the other person over if they showed reluctance. These are preliminary conclusions, however, and need to be substantiated by further comparative data analysis. Analysis of the Japanese data showed that the situation is more complex and I expect that the same would be true in English. Japanese participants were very sensitive to signals during the conversation and the negotiation was directly correlated with the responses of the invitee.

For example, I will now analyze the negotiation in Conversation IV, in particular pointing out how Nakano-san's presentation was influenced by Kato-san's responses. Following Schegloff (1980, 1981), I view the discourse as an interactional achievement which develops over time. I also adopt Sandra Thompson's (personal communication) view of conversation as a dance, in which what each of the participants does influences the other. The dancers are an inseparable unit. Following Erickson (1981) and Erickson and Shultz (1982), I indicated the tempo of this

conversation by marking off the beats and numbering the measures. The numbers mark downbeats and the upbeats are indicated by a ".". I observed a regular tempo throughout the conversations used in this study. Although there were parts where the tempo speeded up or slowed down briefly, overall the beats in Conversation IV occurred at a metronome marking of approximately 112 beats per minute.⁵ Thus, the dancers created and kept time with this tempo. Finally, I used Brown and Levinson (1978) and Brown's (1980) theory of politeness and Erickson and Shultz' (1982) notion of arhythmia to explain the interaction as it developed in the discourse. Arhythmia is realized as a pause, a missed beat or beats, or a change in tempo in the discourse. Erickson and Shultz (1982) found that arhythmia coincided with uncomfortable moments in the discourse and often lead to hyperexplanation or clarification. They have also demonstrated that speakers create Listener Response Relevance Moments (LRRM). These are moments in which the listener is expected to respond. A pause at a LRRM was an example of arhythmia which correlated with uncomfortable moments or misunderstanding. I indicated unfilled LRRMs in the Appendix by dashed lines with asterisks on the missed downbeats (see measures 31-32).

In Conversation VI, Nakano-san and Kato-san exchanged greetings in measures 1 through 4. The tempo quickened in measure 7 and Nakano-san began her presentation of the event using the extended predicate construction without positive or negative evaluation in measures 9 through 27. In measures 7 and 14 she ended her utterances with the sentence final particle ne⁵, "you know?". This created a LRRM and each time Kato-san responded with a minimal listener response, N, "Uh huh". In fact, Kato-san responded frequently, not only after the completion of Nakano-san's clauses and sentences but also mid-clause on an upbeat as in measure 13. At measure 27, Kato-san responded with a minimal verification question, Gokokuzi, "Gokoku Temple?", followed by Hee? in measure 28, a response which expressed surprise or interest in the topic under discussion, roughly equivalent to "wow" in English. This suggested that Kato-san might be more inclined to accept the invitation than not.

The tempo speeded up in measure 29 and signalled a change in Nakano-san's orientation towards Kato-san's attitude about the event. At this point, Nakano-san mentioned what she considered to be one of the impressive points about the tea ceremony, the fact that there would be 8 tearooms. According to Nakano-san the more tearooms the better because one can drink more tea and eat more tea cakes and there is less time to wait. However, despite the favorable aspects of this information, Nakano-san used the same extended predicate form and final sentence particle ne⁵, "you know" that she had used previously, i.e., there was no explicit reference to the fact that there being 8 tearooms was a major selling point. Arhythmia began in measure 31. Although Nakano-san's sentence which ended with ne⁵ created a LRRM on the downbeat of measure 32, a full measure and a half went by without

Kato-san giving even a minimal listener response. After the pause during the LRRM in measure 32, Nakano-san used a negative politeness strategy to avoid imposing on Kato-san. Nakano-san told me that this kind of tea ceremony usually cost ¥5000 or ¥8000, therefore ¥3000 was a bargain. Although the cost of the tea ceremony, ¥3000, was very reasonable, she apologized for the cost being expensive.

- (8) N-Soide tyotto, yoñ-señ-eñ zya nakute, sañ-zeñ-eñ de
 then, just, it's ¥4000, no it's ¥3000 and (so)
takai ñ da kedo,
 it's that it's expensive but..."

The expression, tyotto, "a little bit", in her apology explicitly played down the importance of her utterance.⁶ The fact that Nakano-san misquoted the price may also reflect her discomfort from the previous silence. It is interesting that she misquoted the cost as being higher than it actually was. This might have been a strategy to show that the cost was lower than something although she explicitly stated that it was expensive. If Nakano-san had played up the reasonableness of the cost at this point it would have made it more difficult for Kato-san to refuse. Pushing the information at this point would have been viewed as an imposition, rather than a positive attempt to create involvement.

Measure 36 also went by in silence. Nakano-san hesitated for a full measure in measure 37. Then Nakano-san and Kato-san overlapped speech on the downbeat of measure 38. Nakano-san said Mosi, "if", maybe about to say, "if it's alright with you, how would it be or won't you come?" and at the same time Kato-san asked, Iku no?, "Is it that going will take place?". The content of these utterances suggested that Nakano-san and Kato-san had been concerned with different issues. Since Kato-san had not been explicitly invited, it was difficult for her to accept or refuse. She would have been in an awkward situation if she had said that she was interested in going only to find out that in fact this was not an invitation but merely a discussion of events. In doing this she would have imposed on Nakano-san's negative face by implying that they were closer friends than they were. She initiated a repair sequence in measure 38 and cleverly tried to get Nakano-san to commit herself to whether or not this was an invitation, without seeming too forward.

- (9) Iku no?
 go IPF NOM
 Is it that going will take place?
 Is it that you're/we're going?

Kato-san's question contained no explicit subject reference. It literally means "Is it that going will take place?" and could be interpreted as "Is it that you're (Nakano-san) going?" or "Is it that we're going?". Following the overlap, there was a series of

measures with intermittent silence where the beat was less clear and their utterances were less synchronized. Nakano-san missed the downbeat of measure 39 with her utterance of surprise un?, "what?" and Kato-san's repetition of her question Iku no?, also did not coincide with the beat. Nakano-san gave an affirmative answer in measure 41 but still did not commit herself to the invitation. Nakano-san was worried that Kato-san might refuse. Although Kato-san had expressed her positive interest in measure 28, she had not responded in measures 32 or 36. Kato-san gave a positive assessment of the situation in measures 41 to 42, A hoñtoo-ii na., "Oh really. That's nice". They laughed for three beats and were silent for 2 measures. Kato-san's explicit positive assessment after her side of the confusion was resolved indicated to Nakano-san that the risk of putting Kato-san into a position where she would refuse was low. In addition, Kato-san's repair strategy suggested that her lack of response in measure 32 and 36 was due to a misunderstanding rather than a lack of interest in the event. Thus, in measure 46 Nakano-san made her invitation more explicit with her question Doo? Nañka., "How would it be? somehow." After more negotiation Kato-san answered Nakano-san's invitation with a tentative yes, Itte miyoo ka na., "I guess I might go" in measure 57.

Thus, Nakano-san and Kato-san were talking at different levels of abstraction. This lead to arrhythmia and the conversation did not make any headway. Nakano-san was operating with the invitation as her premise. She assumed that this was an invitation and was concerned with whether or not Kato-san would be interested in going. She used a negative politeness strategy in order to avoid putting Kato-san into a position where she would have to refuse. Kato-san, on the other hand, did not seem to have accepted the same premise. She was wondering whether or not Nakano-san was inviting her to go in the first place. Kato-san's lack of response reflected her confusion about the steps of the dance, about what Nakano-san was getting at, rather than a lack of interest in accepting the invitation. At measure 38, Nakano-san and Kato-san stepped on one another's toes and the need arose to stop the dance and to discuss the steps. Their overlapped utterances in measure 38 expressed their respective views of the situation. Nakano-san had proceeded with her invitation in mind while Kato-san was asking about the steps of the dance.

Language interaction is often likened to a game. Bateson describes "play" as follows.

These actions, in which we now engage, do not denote what would be denoted by those actions which these actions denote. (1972: 180)

He gives a parallel example of monkeys playing.

The playful nip denotes the bite, but it does not denote what would be denoted by the bite. (1972:180)

Nakano-san's invitation was off-record. The words Nakano-san used in presenting the tea ceremony event did not denote those actions which they would denote, i.e., a discussion of events,

but rather served as a metacommunicative abstraction for an invitation. Bateson has also observed that the discrimination between map and territory can break down. There is often mediation between levels of nipping and biting, between play and the real thing. In measure 38, the higher level of invitation degenerated into a discussion of the steps of the dance. Nakano-san and Kato-san negotiated their respective views of the situation mediating back and forth between a discussion of events and the invitation.

The fact that many linguists and the Japanese themselves claim that Vroot + -(a)nai ka is the standard invitation/request form suggests that using this form would unmistakably indicate an invitation/request. This would involve a lower level of abstraction since the words would denote the actions they should denote. However, there is in fact some level of abstraction involved even in the standard form as can be seen in example (10) below.

- (10) Otya mesiaḡari-mas-eñ ka ✓
 Japanese tea drink HON,POL-DIST-NEG, IPF Q
 a. "Won't (you) drink (some) Japanese tea?"
 b. "Don't (you) drink Japanese tea?"

As indicated by the two possible translational equivalents this question could be either an invitation to drink tea, or a question as to whether the addressee drinks tea. It is not uncommon to be served tea in Japan when one is waiting to see someone at an office, for example. The question in (10) might be uttered before bringing the tea out or, as is often the case, the tea might be brought out without asking anything first. Knowing this custom and the fact that almost all Japanese drink Japanese tea, most Japanese would interpret (10) as being an invitation to have tea. However, a westerner who is not used to drinking tea while waiting in an office and who might in fact justifiably prefer coffee, might interpret this as an inquiry about whether or not they drink Japanese tea. Therefore, the standard invitation/request form can involve some level of abstraction. However, the fact that Japanese do not mention the use of the extended predicate construction as a standard invitation/request form suggests that the use of the extended predicate in Conversations I, II and IV represents a higher level of abstraction. One might raise the question of why people speak at levels of abstraction where actions or words do not denote what would be denoted by those words which these words would denote. Why use more abstract expressions instead of the form which everyone claims is the standard?

The higher levels of abstraction used in the invitation in Conversation IV were necessary because this invitation involved the most risk. Nakano-san did not invite Kato-san to do things very often, and although they were friends, they were not that close yet. There was also risk involved in Conversations I and II, but the level of risk was lower because Nakano-san and Shiba-

san and Ichikawa-san shared many prior invitation texts and their friendships were close. An occasional refusal was not injurious to their relationships. Conversation III between Nakano-san and her aunt was a situation where Nakano-san was not in the habit of making invitations, but here the risk of the aunt refusing was not as high as in Conversation IV. Nakano-san's relationship with her aunt was very stable, and she and her aunt, as relatives, were in-group by definition. It is interesting, however, that Nakano-san did offer her aunt an out by suggesting she didn't have the time when the aunt seemed reluctant. Finally, in the example in (10) where the standard invitation/request form is used to offer tea, again the risk involved in refusing tea is very low. In Japan, if the question is asked at all it is simply a formality. Tea may be served even if the answer is negative, the negative answer being interpreted as an instance where the addressee is showing restraint though they in fact really want some tea.

Higher levels of abstraction are used when speaking off record and reduce the risk involved in a face threatening act. Whether or not more abstract forms are used depends on the amount of risk involved. An invitation to a tea ceremony presents more risk than an invitation to drink tea in an office, where it is alright to accept and not drink the tea. Also, an invitation to a tea ceremony can present more or less risk depending on the relationship of the participants. Thus, the consequences were less risky with an aunt than with close friends who often did things together and most risky with a friend who was less close and with whom Nakano-san associated less often. Higher levels of abstraction lower the risk involved. It is interesting that Shiba-san and Ichikawa-san were quick to respond to Nakano-san's invitation in Conversations I and II, respectively. Their ease of interpretation suggested that the extended predicate form had become routinized and thus had lost some of its abstractness. In effect, it appeared to have lost some of its off-record quality. Quick perception of Nakano-san's invitation was also a way of affirming the closeness of their relationship.

The fact that the Japanese Vroot + -(a)nai ka/ form and English "Would you like to do X with me?" forms are recognized as standard invitation/request forms, is a reflection of the global concerns involved in making an invitation in the respective societies. Hopper has observed that the grammaticalizations of tense-aspect forms are typical extensions of the aspectual functions central to the discourse as a universal phenomenon. Form must have some meaning to enable communication, but "the more abstract or 'grammatical' a morpheme is the more it draws upon context for its interpretation" (1982: 4). The Japanese culture is other-oriented and as I have suggested, in making an invitation the concern is to avoid threatening the invitee's negative face by putting them into a position where they have to refuse. The standard invitation/request form can be seen as an extension of the way an invitation functions in the culture. In

Japanese, yes-no questions are answered based on whether the question is true or not, i.e., one answers, "yes, it is true" or "no, it isn't true" as illustrated in (11) below. Thus, a negative question allows one to answer in the negative but still be affirmative.

- (11) Ikanai ? Ee, ikanai.
 go NEG Q yes go NEG
 Will you not go? Yes, I will not go.

Similarly, offering a way out when the invitee seems reluctant with a negative question, as Nakano-san did in Conversation III, line 5, also allows the invitee to refuse and still be affirmative. For example, in response to Nakano-san's suggestion to her aunt of a possible way out, Zikañ nai ka., "You don't have any time?", the aunt could have refused in the affirmative by saying Ee, tyotto, "Yes, it's a bit". The fact that the question is worded in the negative also reflects the tendency for Japanese to present things in an apologetic negative light and downplay favorable impressive information. English, "Do you want to go...?" assumes that the other would like to go. It reflects the tendency to present the event in a positive light. Playing up positive impressive information is a way of involving the invitee in English invitations. However, these statements serve as no more than a generalization and do not explain how one would actually proceed in a particular context in either society. The use of standard forms reflects a static view of language. In actuality, the meanings are negotiated within each context and emerge from the particularity of each situation. Because of the dynamic context-sensitivity involved in invitations, it is not surprising that the standard Vroot + -(a)nai ka/form occurs infrequently in invitations in actual use.

I would like to thank David Andow, Kim Jones, Bruce Mannheim, Yael Maschler, Mayumi Sakuma Sensee and Paul Woodward for their many helpful comments in discussions and readings of earlier drafts of this paper. I also wish to thank the participants in the telephone conversations used in this study for their cooperation and assistance and Yuko Nakagawa for her help in transcribing the data.

1 See Jorden 1963, Shibatani 1972, Kageyama and Ikuhiro 1975-6, Miyagawa 1982, Japanese Language Research Group 1983, Jorden and Noda in press.


2 Abbreviations in the examples stand for the following:
 V=verbal, NEG=negative, IPF=imperfective, Q=question,
 HON=honorific, POL=polite, DIST=distal

3 The methodology used in this analysis follows that of Schegloff (1980,1981), Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), Erickson (1981), Erickson and Shultz (1982), Brown and Levinson (1978) and Brown (1980).

4 The romanization used in this paper follows that of Jorden (in press) with the exception that vowel lengthening beyond that typically given in the dictionary is given by ":".

The conversations were transcribed from left to right in paired lines. Each line contains utterances by the respective participants in the conversation. Earlier utterances appear further to the left on these paired lines. The paired lines should be read together to get a sense of how the interaction progressed in the conversation. Overlap is indicated by brackets around the overlapped speech as in the following example,

N- [Mosi]
K- [Iku no?]

Breath marks are indicated by "'". "" indicates a speed up in tempo.

5 I used a complicated procedure to determine the tempo of this conversation. First, I had someone watch me as I conducted this conversation as an orchestra conductor would conduct an orchestra and count the number of beats in a minute. This gave me a general idea of the appropriate metronome marking. Then, I set up two tape recorders and played the conversation on one tape recorder while recording onto a second, at the same time tapping the beats with a pencil. Afterwards I listened to the second tape recorder at low speed to get a more precise idea of where the beats coincided with the speech.

6 Matsumoto (1985) claims that tyotto "conveys the unimportance of the content of the assertion ... and allows the addressee to pay less attention to the statement". Jorden and Noda (in press) have also referred to tyotto as a belittler because it reduces the importance of the utterance.

References

- Bateson, Gregory. 1972. Steps to an Ecology of Mind. N.Y.: Chandler Publishing Co.
- Becker, A. L. 1979. Text-Building, Epistemology, and Aesthetics in Javanese Shadow Theatre. In A. L. Becker and Aram A. Yengoyan, eds. The Imagination of Reality: Essays in Southeast Asian Coherence Systems, 211-43. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Pub.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. 1978. Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena. In Esther Goody, ed. Questions and Politeness, 96-134. N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Penelope. 1980. How and Why are Women More Polite: Some Evidence from a Mayan Community. In Sally McConnell-Ginet, Ruth Borker and Nelly Furman, eds. Women and Language in Literature and Society, 111-36. N.Y.: Praeger Pub.

- Erickson, Frederick. 1981. Money Tree, Lasagna Bush, Salt and Pepper: Social Construction of Topical Cohesion in a Conversation among Italian-Americans. Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics, ed. by Deborah Tannen, 43-70. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- _____ and Jeffrey Shultz. 1982. The Counselor as Gatekeeper. N.Y.: Academic Press Inc.
- Fiksdal, Susan. 1986. The Right Time and Pace. The University of Michigan: Ph.D. thesis.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1982. Aspect Between Discourse and Grammar: An Introductory Essay for the Volume. In Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics, ed. by Paul J. Hopper, 3-18. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub.
- Japanese Language Research Group, University of Tsukuba. 1983. Nihongo Hyoogen Bunkee (Intermediate Textbook I and II). Tokyo: ISEBU Publishing Co.
- Jorden, Eleanor H. 1963. Beginning Japanese. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- _____ and Mari Noda. In press. Japanese: The Spoken Language. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kageyama, Taro and Ikuhiro Tamori. 1975-6. Japanese Whimperatives. Papers in Japanese Linguistics 4. 13-54.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1985. A Sort of Speech Act Qualification in Japanese: CHOTTO. Journal of Asian Culture 9. 143-59.
- Miyakawa, Shigeru. 1982. Requesting in Japanese. Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese 17:2. 123-42.
- Noda, Mari. 1981. An Analysis of the Japanese Extended Predicate: A Pragmatic Approach to the System and Pedagogical Implications. Cornell University: M.A. Thesis.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emmanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. A Simplest Systematics of Turn-Taking for Conversation. Language 50. 696-735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1980. Preliminaries to preliminaries: 'Can I ask you a question'. Sociological Inquiry 50. 104-52.
- _____. 1981. Discourse as an Interactional Achievement: Some Uses of 'Uh huh' and Other Things that Come Between Sentences. Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics, ed. by Deborah Tannen, 71-83. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1972. Negative Questions and Conveyed Meaning. Papers in Japanese Linguistics 1:2. 321-3.
- Szatrowski, Polly. 1986. Danwa no Bunseki to Kyoozyuhoo (Discourse Analysis and Japanese Pedagogy). Nihongogaku 5:11. 27-81.

APPENDIX

CONVERSATION I: (N=Nakano-sa \bar{n} , female 27 --> S=Shiba-sa \bar{n} , female 25)

- 1.N-Sore kara ne ζ Anoo KO \bar{N} DO ne ζ otyakai \bar{g} a aru NO yo.
Then, you know? Um. THIS TIME, you know? it's that there's a tea ceremony!
2.S- \bar{N} .
Uh huh.

3.N-uti no syusai no. Siti-g \bar{a} tu no mik-ka, nitiyoobi.
sponsored by my group.July 3rd, Sunday.

- 4.S- \bar{N} . A. Watasi dame da to omou wa-
Uh huh. Oh. I think I can't!

- 5.N-
6.S-hakkiri itte:
to be frank

CONVERSATION II: (N=Nakano-sa \bar{n} , female 27 --> I=Ichikawa-sa \bar{n} , female 28)

- 1.N-Ano ne ζ anoo, tabu \bar{f} i doo ka naa to omou \bar{N} da kedo,
Um, you know? Um it's that I think you probably won't be interested but,

- 2.I-
3.N-MATA otyakai \bar{g} a aru \bar{N} da kedo, Eeto, siti-g \bar{a} tu no mik-ka.
it's that there's a tea ceremony AGAIN but, Um, July 3rd.

- 4.I- Itu?
When?

- 5.N-
6.I-siti-g \bar{a} tu no mik-ka, A, watasi mik-ka to too-ka tenisu no siai,
July 3rd. Oh. I the 3rd and the 10th are tennis matches,

- 7.N-
8.I-nitiyoobi desyoo.
it's Sunday isn't it.

CONVERSATION III: (N=Nakano-sa \bar{n} , female 27 --> A=Nakano-sa \bar{n} 's aunt, female 42)

- 1.N-Siti-g \bar{a} tu no mik-ka ni ne ζ Otyakai \bar{g} a aru \bar{N} da kedo,
On July 3rd, you know?, It's that there's a tea ceremony but
2.A- Siti-gatu mik-ka?
July 3rd?

- 3.N-IKANAI? \bar{N} . Gokoku \bar{z} i.
Won't you go? Uh huh. Gokoku Temple.
4.A- U \bar{n} ? Otyakai? Doko de? (Laugh)
What? A tea ceremony? Where?

- 5.N- Aa. Zika \bar{n} nai ka.
Oh. You don't have the time?

- 6.A-Moo ho \bar{n} to tooku natyatta mo \bar{n} nee. \bar{N} . \bar{N} .
Oh it's really far away, isn't it. Uh. Uh.

- 7.N- \bar{N} . \bar{N} .
Uh.Uh.

- 8.A-Nitiyoobi. Doo ka naa. Mada yoosuru ni katatuite nai NO yo.
Sunday. I wonder. In short, it's that I haven't cleaned up yet!

CONVERSATION IV: (N=Nakano-sa \bar{n} , female 27 --> Kato-sa \bar{n} , female 31)

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| N-Mosimosi.
Hello. | | Ko \bar{n} ba \bar{n} wa.
Good evening. | |
| K- | Hai.
Yes. | | Ko \bar{n} ba \bar{n} wa.
Good evening. |
| ----- | | | |
| 5 | 6 | 7 \rightsquigarrow | 8 |
| N-(Laugh) | | Ano ne $\acute{}$
Um, you know? | |
| K- | (Laugh) | | \bar{N} .
Uh huh. |
| ----- | | | |
| 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| N-Zitu wa anoo
The fact is, um, it's that there's a tea ceremony on this coming Sunday | otyakai \bar{g} a ko \bar{n} do no siti- \bar{g} atu::: | | no mik-ka ka na
niti- |
| K- | | | |
| ----- | | | |
| 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| N-yoobi
July 3rd. | aru NO ne $\acute{}$
you know? | | Soide sa
And, you know, |
| K- | \bar{N} .
Uh huh. | \bar{N} .
Uh huh. | |
| ----- | | | |
| 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| N-Anoo
Um | ko \bar{n} do
this time my | watasi no hoo no
Gaimusyoo no
the Foreign Ministry's | hoo no se \bar{n} see no
teacher's |
| K- | | | |
| ----- | | | |
| 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
| N-Anoo:::
Ummmm | Gooyuukai to yuu | kai \bar{g} a aru \bar{N} da kedo sono betu no sensee | |
| K- | It's that there's a club called the Friendship Club but this other | | |
| ----- | | | |
| 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |
| N- \bar{g} a
teacher it 's that she'll do it at Gokoku Temple. Uh huh. | Gokokuzi de yaru wake. | \bar{N} . | |
| K- | | Gokokuzi.
Gokoku Temple? | Hee?
Wow. |
| ----- | | | |
| 29 | \rightsquigarrow 30 | 31 | 32 |
| N- \bar{N} .
Uh huh. | Asoko has-seki aru NO ne $\acute{}$
It's that there will be 8 tearooms, you know? | | **-----Soide tyotto
Then just |
| K- | | | **----- |
| ----- | | | |
| 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 |
| N-yo \bar{n} -se \bar{n} -e \bar{n}
it's Y4000, no Y3000 | zya nakute sa \bar{n} -ze \bar{n} -e \bar{n} de
and (so) it's that it's expensive but | takai \bar{N} da kedo- | **----- |
| K- | | | **----- |
| ----- | | | |

37 N-Anoo::::: 38 Mosi 39 Uñ? 40
 Ummmmmm If Huh?
 K- Iku NO? Iku NO?
 Is it that going will take place? Is it that going will take place?
 Is it that you're/we're going? Is it that you're/we're going?

41 N-Nñ. 42 43 44
 Uh huh. (Laugh)
 K- A hoñtoo-ii na. (Laugh) (Laugh)
 Oh really-that's nice.

45 N-** 46 Doo? 47 nañka 48
 How would it be? somehow
 K-** Itu made ni kimenakya ike-
 When is it that I have to

49 N- 50 51 52
 **---Itu made tte narubeku nara hayai hoo gā ii ñ da kedo
 By when? if possible it's that the earlier the better but
 K-nai NO? decide by?

53 N-** 54 55 56
 N. Uh huh.
 K-** A soo. Oh really.

57 N-
 K-Itte miyoo ka na.
 I guess I might go.